

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/747,614	STOKES ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Stephen R. Koziol	2624	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Stephen R. Koziol.

(3) Catherine Voisinet.

(2) Yosef Kassa.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 25 January 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,27 and 29.

Identification of prior art discussed: "Color Consistency and Adobe Creative Suite" Adobe White Paper.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

YOSEF KASSA
PRIMARY EXAMINER





Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Adobe art cited was discussed with respect to the currently amended claims. It was agreed that the amendments overcome the cited art and that the amended claims would be subject to additional search. In addition, the 101 rejection of claims 27 and 29 was discussed with reference to the "carrier wave" language of paragraph 0024 of the specification. No immediate agreement was reached on the need to amend either claim 27 or the specification. Applicant was informed that the "software architecture" language of claim 29 would be deemed non-statutory under 35 USC 101.